

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/810,650 | URANO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D. | 1626 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: 433

(1) Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D. (3) _____.

(2) James E. Armstrong IV {Reg. No. 42,266}. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 June 2006

Time: 10:22am

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Applicant's representative to discuss the reason for not entering the after-final amendment filed with the Brief on April 27, 2006. The Examiner informed Mr. Armstrong that the amendment to the specification and claims were not in accordance with reissue amendment practice, nor were any of the previous amendments. Mr. Armstrong indicated that another after-final amendment would be filed which will be in accordance with reissue amendment practice.

888
6/1/06